REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12 and 14-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 12 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Claims 2, 8, 9 and 13 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in those claims. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Tsui and Hong in the September 12, 2006 personal interview, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action indicates that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on April 18, 2006 was not considered as to the merits. Based on the discussion during the personal interview, the Examiner agreed to consider this IDS, as filed on April 18, without resubmission by Applicants. Applicants appreciate the consideration of this IDS by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner signify consideration of the references forwarded in the April 18 IDS by initialing and forwarding to Applicants' representative a copy of the form PTO-1449 attached to the April 18 IDS.

The Office Action objects to claim 7 for an informality. Claim 7 is amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 7 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as lacking proper antecedent basis for the feature of "the selected document". Claims 1 and 12 are amended to obviate this rejection.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0120648A1 to Ball et al. (hereinafter "Ball") in

view of Liu et al. (ACM, published: Year 2000, pages 512-519) (hereinafter "Liu"); rejects

claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ball in view of Liu and further in view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,952,801 B2 to Warmus et al. (hereinafter "Warmus"); and rejects claims 7-11 under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) over Ball in view of Liu and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,384 B2

to Jeffery et al. (hereinafter "Jeffery"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that previous versions of the claims did not require

automatic outputting to be independent with respect to manual user selection for comparing a

selected document and a past (most recently accessed) version.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, obtaining a most recent version of an

information object as the selected version of the information object requested by the user;

obtaining a previous version of the information object based on a result of identifying a user,

the previous version of the information object being a version of the information object most

recently accessed by the user; automatically determining a difference between the selected

version of the information object and the previous version of the information object; and

automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the

difference. These steps are undertaken in response to the request for the information object.

Claims 7 and 12 recite similar features.

These features were discussed during the September 12, 2006 personal interview with

the Examiners. The Examiners did not rebut the assertion that these features were not taught,

nor otherwise rendered obvious, by any permissible combination of the applied prior art

references.

In particular, in paragraphs [0049], [0071], and [0089]-[0093], Ball teaches only

periodically checking a repository for updates to documents. Thus, changes to a document

indicated by Ball may not reflect a most recently-current version of the document. Ball also teaches that a user manually initiates a comparison between the selected document and a past version (see paragraphs [0038]-[0040], [0054]).

Examiner Hong noted, during the personal interview, that periodic checking as disclosed in Ball would not allow selection of versions of information objects where no change was detected, whereas the pending claims automatically select a most recently-accessed version and a most recent version for comparison, regardless of whether differences are detected.

No permissible combination of the applied prior art references teaches, or otherwise renders obvious, these features. Liu discloses a process that periodically checks selected web pages for changes (see, e.g., pg. 513, col. 2, lines 4-10). These scheduled checks and comparisons cannot reasonably be considered to correspond to the features recited in the pending claims that are undertaken in response to a user request. Liu discloses notifying a user when a scheduled check detects a change. As such, this reference does not teach, or otherwise render obvious, outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the differences, in response to a user request. Further, like Ball, no output would be generated if no differences were detected between a most-recently accessed version and a most recent version.

Additionally, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Ball with Liu in the manner suggested by the Office Action because such modification would impermissibly modify the method of operation of Ball. Specifically, Ball teaches presenting the user with a list of versions to compare, whereas Liu teaches automatically notifying a user of changes to specified web pages (see paragraph [0054] of Ball and page 513, col. 2, lines 9-10 of Liu). Liu updates the cache copy of a web page with the changed version (see page 514, col. 2, lines 8-13). This allows Liu to keep a reference version in the cache, but does not

provide multiple versions from which to choose, as in Ball. As such, modifying Ball with the reference cache of Liu, would impermissibly modify Ball's method of allowing selection of various versions of an object and make it unsuitable for its intended purpose.

For at least the above reasons, the applied prior art references do not teach, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 12. Further, claims 3-6, 11 and 14-16 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by any combination of the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on independent claims 1, 7 and 12, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3-7, 10-12 and 14-16 as being anticipated by, or unpatentable over, the applied prior art references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-7, 10-12 and 14-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay, II
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:JEG/hms

Date: September 27, 2006

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461